

Joyce

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

NFAC Notice  
No. 20-227

NFAC N 20-227  
21 April 1980

MANAGEMENT ADVISORY GROUP  
FOR THE  
NATIONAL FOREIGN ASSESSMENT CENTER (NFAC MAG)

Reference : DDI N 1-35, dated 11 July 1973  
Rescission: NFAC N 20-65, dated 22 May 1979

1. The Management Advisory Group for the National Foreign Assessment Center (NFAC MAG) was established to assist the D/NFAC and other managers in the Center in improving the operation of NFAC. NFAC MAG is not intended to supplant the authority of existing line and staff components, but can serve as an informal supplement to established channels of communication. NFAC MAG will identify problems worthy of management attention and will suggest solutions for these and other matters already identified by management.

2. The current members and their alternates are:

25X1A		<u>Name</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Extension</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Term Expires</u>	
25X1			OIA		3N130 3N100	30 Sep 1980	25X1A
			OCR		1H18 Hqs GE78 Hqs	30 Sep 1980	
			OCO		7G30 Hqs 7F33 Hqs	30 Sep 1980	
			OPA		6G22 Hqs 6G42 Hqs	30 Sep 1980	
			OGCR		Bg 159E 1132 Ames	30 Sep 1980	
			OCO OCR		7G15 Hqs 1H18 Hqs	30 Sep 1980	
			OSWR OGCR		5G48 Hqs 1232 Ames	30 Sep 1980	
			OSWR		5G11 Hqs 5G48 Hqs	31 Mar 1981	25X1

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

25X1A

<u>Name</u>	<u>Office</u>	<u>Extension</u>	<u>Address</u>	<u>Term Expires</u>
<div></div>	OER	<div></div>	4G32 Hqs	31 Mar 1981
			3G46 Hqs	
	OSR		2G00 Hqs	31 Mar 1981
			2G31 Hqs	

Bruce C. Clarke, Jr.  
Director  
National Foreign Assessment Center

25X1

25X1A

Distribution "B" (All Employees)

C-O-N-F-I-D-E-N-T-I-A-L

STAT

Approved For Release 2002/05/07 : CIA-RDP82B00876R000100100001-5

Next 1 Page(s) In Document Exempt

Approved For Release 2002/05/07 : CIA-RDP82B00876R000100100001-5

27 March 1978

MEMORANDUM FOR: All OGCR Personnel

SUBJECT : 1977 OGCR MAG Activities

STATINTL  
STATINTL  
STATINTL  
1. OGCR/MAG activities during the past year centered almost entirely around [ ] sessions in one form or another; during the spring and summer, members discussed guest speakers, topics, and choice of the appropriate moderator for the summer/fall general sessions. Later meetings were centered around development of the best representative menu of concerns that arose from the general sessions for presentation and discussion at the managers' conference held [ ] on 9-10 January 1978. [ ] interacted with the MAG during the year and D/GCR presented a synopsis of the managers' conference to the MAG.

STATINTL

2. Summer/Fall Sessions

STATINTL

Written comments submitted to the MAG members following each ISO session indicated that all sessions were quite successful. [ ] received high marks as an organizer and moderator for the meetings. Many of the comments spoke highly of Dave's ability to provide enough guidance to get the conferences moving without over-influencing group action or openness or wasting time with excessive monologue. There was praise as well for the candid responses by our Director to the various groups' prioritized concerns. Employees came away from the sessions with a sense of trust in the top management and appreciated their expressed desire to listen to and to discuss employee questions. The evening soiree and camaraderie was obviously a delight to many of our members.

3. The Managers' Conference

STATINTL  
STATINTL  
[ ] met with the Division, Branch, and Team chiefs [ ] on 9-10 January 1978. The purpose of the conference was to answer the concerns of OGCR employees that were raised during the

ADMINISTRATIVE-INTERNAL USE ONLY

1977 general office sessions. The conference was organized into three phases: (1) to make recommendations for action on the broader issues and concerns that were raised; (2) to formulate actions to answer concerns that were identified within a particular division; and (3) to formulate specific managerial concerns for presentation to D/GCR and DD/GCR.

The participants were divided into four teams for discussion of employee concerns. Each team was comprised of a division chief and a branch or team chief from other Division elements. The teams were assigned topics from a list of concerns which represented MAG's condensation of the original 85 concerns voiced by employees. The managers were then asked to make recommendations for action on their assigned topics and to make presentations to the group and D/GCR--the moderator for the managers' conference. The teams were also asked to submit written recommendations to D/GCR for further consideration.

Some recommendations made by management in response to concerns were:

Concern: Some Division/Branch supervisors are not helpful in identifying training needed to develop employee potential.

Recommendation:

(1) The individual employee should make an effort to keep up to date; the immediate supervisor should aid the individual and suggest sources of information and independently recommend training; OTR should be sure everyone has access to OTR catalogs and other training offerings; Division or Center chiefs should see that Personnel Development Profiles (PDP) are in-line with that component's mission; and the Office Career Development Officer (DD/GCR) should set general training standards and be available for consultation with individuals who want to discuss their career pattern. All of these people are action officers and all should make an effort to grease the path to training courses when they are warranted and justifiable.

(2) CD/V has developed a very useful chart depicting a detailed training and travel record of each person in that unit. Anyone using such a chart could tell at a glance who had what course and when, where gaps in the individual's training existed, and where emphasis had been. Each course listed was grouped under such subheads as Basic, Language, Area, Skills, Management, Travel, etc. Our (the team managers discussing this topic) recommendation is that such a chart be developed for every

unit in OGCR as a planning aid for managers and individuals. The team also suggested that everyone should have access to the chart so that each employee could see readily what courses had been taken by whom and what kind of training was available. The action office for creation of these charts should be the Administrative Staff, and the data should be computerized so that updated charts could be available on order.

STATINTL

[ ] concurred with the chart idea and proposed that St/A draw up such a chart for each Branch manager.

Concern: Fitness Reports do not adequately explain strengths and weaknesses.

Recommendation: The managers discussing this problem agreed that the issue was valid and recommended that a notice be prepared for all employees stating that henceforth it will be mandatory for supervisors to address strengths and weaknesses in FRs. In addition, a statement will be attached to each FR explaining to future readers that the weakness narrative is the result of an Office Notice. Supervisors should be encouraged to prepare honest reports for the sake of the employee and the Agency.

This recommendation was discussed at length by the entire group; pros and cons were pointed out. It was generally agreed that there is room for improvement of employee assessments but there has been no policy decision as to how or if this recommendation will be implemented.

STATINTL

STATINTL

[ ] commented that the FR issue was precipitated by a lack of frankness between the manager and the employee. [ ] indicated that perhaps an Office Notice needed to be issued stating that Fitness Reports must contain a paragraph on a person's strengths and weaknesses as well as a paragraph on training. The suggestion was debated but no decision was reached.

Concern: The Quality Step Increase (QSI) is not used enough, particularly when headroom limitations prohibit promotion or an individual has reached his/her promotional limits but continues to do good work.

Recommendation: Establish a QSI panel in each Division which will meet twice a year to review the roster and identify personnel deserving a QSI. This would not preclude the awarding of a QSI at any other time of year for special cases. The suggestion was also made that the QSI panel be used to recommend honor and merit awards.

The group and the Director and Deputy Director agreed that use of QSIs should be increased especially with the predicted tightening of the NFAC promotion policy.

Office Score on QSIs:

<u>FY</u>	<u>CD</u>	<u>MLD</u>	<u>GD</u>	<u>OD</u>	<u>ERAC</u>	<u>Total</u>
1978 (to date)	0	0	0	0	2	2
1977	2	0	0	0	-	2
1976	5	1	3	1	-	10
1975	0	0	2	0	-	2

Concern: Employees mentioned that some supervisors are unwilling or unprepared to accept new demands brought on by changing techniques in analysis and personnel management.

Recommendation: Office and Division level management must take a closer look at Branch and Team chiefs to determine their ability and willingness to accept new managerial and analytical concepts and techniques. Recognized weaknesses should be corrected with proper indoctrination and training.

This recommendation was accepted by the group as the direction to take. D/GCR stated that the myth that "managers just happen" must be dispelled. A more careful analysis in the selection-in, selection-out, and training of new and old managers must be made. An effort must be made to ensure that "old" managers recognize and accept new management concepts and philosophies.

STATINTL

Personnel Action and Policies

STATINTL

4. There have already been some results from the managers' conference. [ ] an OGCR editor, has been selected on a trial basis to be the Office representative on the National Intelligence Daily (NID) Production Board. This action was taken largely in response to a suggestion made at [ ]

5. A second action was taken in response to MAG's implication that Division attitudes toward Fitness Report letter ratings are not consistent. At the suggestion of D/GCR, [ ] St/A, conducted an Office-wide

STATINTL

survey showing the percentages of overall O, S, and P ratings by Division. The survey verified the inconsistency and pointed up that in some Divisions the percentage of S's in FR ratings reach 60 percent or above while in other Divisions the percentage of S's ranged from 30 to 40 percent. The variation in FR letter ratings does not necessarily demonstrate improper management on the part of any Division, nor does it mean one Division is necessarily better than another. It may reflect differences in management philosophy, however. Those Divisions with a higher percentage of P's are probably more in line with the DDI guidelines issued several years ago which directed that "most" employees should be in the P category; the Divisions with a higher percentage of S's have reverted back to the higher standards they believe justified and which is probably more in line with other NFAC offices. Whatever the reasons for the inconsistency, our front office as well as the Division chiefs are aware of the problem and [redacted] are contemplating methods to improve the balance.

STATINTL

6. OGCR has instituted a personnel review policy designed to partially overcome Branch and Division inconsistencies in initiating promotion action. Ostensibly the policy will eliminate the problem of the "forgotten" employee by reviewing annually, or semi-annually, if possible, all employees GS-12 and below for promotability over the next six to twelve months. Review by the Career Board does not replace or substitute for independent promotion actions taken by Branch chiefs, however. All promotion actions will be considered, as usual, on the first Tuesday of the month.

7. The varied interpretations of Fitness Report ratings through the Divisions as well as other personnel management imperfections point up the need for NFAC personnel guidelines. New NFAC personnel regulations have been drafted and are awaiting review and approval by D/NFAC. Among other things those guidelines re-emphasize are: (1) use of the Letter of Instruction and (2) the Personnel Development Profile (PDP); the training aspect of the PDP has been given special emphasis under the new regulations. STATINTL

8. The MAG has been restructured, at the direction of [redacted] to include one additional clerical for a total of two, and to allow broader grade representation. Earlier MAGs had a grade ceiling of GS-12 established by the past Office Director, Jack King. Now each Division is allowed one member in the GS-12 to GS-14 category as long as they are outside the management structure and one in the GS-8 to GS-11 category. The 1978 MAG is comprised of the following personnel: [redacted] Chairperson, and

STATINTL



ADMINISTRATIVE-INTERNAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2002/05/07 : CIA-RDP82B00876R000100100001-5

STATINTL


are the clerical representatives.

STATINTL

STATINTL

9. [ ] indicates that he intends to compile a memo for office-wide circulation giving his impressions of all [ ] sessions and, where appropriate, indicate the status of corrective action.

STATINTL

OGCR/MAG

*1-3; Dissemination to all Employees*

ADMINISTRATIVE-INTERNAL USE ONLY

Approved For Release 2002/05/07 : CIA-RDP82B00876R000100100001-5